

FILED

4:39 pm, 6/8/21

U.S. Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING

THE TRIAL LAWYERS COLLEGE, a
nonprofit corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case Number: 1:20-CV-00080-JMC-MLC

GERRY SPENCES TRIAL LAWYERS
COLLEGE AT THUNDERHEAD RANCH,
a nonprofit corporation, and GERALD L.
SPENCE, JOHN ZELBST, REX PARRIS,
JOSEPH H. LOW, KENT SPENCE, JOHN
JOYCE, and DANIEL AMBROSE
individuals,

Defendants,

GERALD L. SPENCE and REX PARRIS,

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE TRIAL LAWYERS COLLEGE, a
nonprofit corporation, JOHN SLOAN,
JAMES R. CLERY, JR., MILTON
GRIMES, DANA COLE, MAREN
CHALOUPKA, and ANNE VALENTINE,

Counterclaim and Third-Party Defendants.

CIVIL MINUTE SHEET INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE

☒ This was a Telephonic Hearing

Date: 6/8/2021 Time: 3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. (Telephonic)

Mark L. Carman
Judge

Clerk

Reporter

Brent R. Rhodes
Law Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Christopher Ralston, Matthew Slaughter and Patrick Murphy

Attorneys for Defendants

Beth Kushner and Timothy Getzoff

Other:

MINUTE SHEET
1:20-CV-00080-JMC-MLC

An informal discovery conference was held on 6/8/21. The Court discussed three separate issues. First, the Court heard argument concerning discovery requests focusing on a listserv Defendants may have information about. The Court has given the parties permission to file and brief a motion to compel concerning the issue. However, the Court accepts representations made by counsel that Defendants do not have discoverable information/documents on this issue. If, though, it is discovered that any information has been withheld from appropriate discovery requests, the parties should expect sanctions.

Next, the Court heard argument about specific discovery requests concerning Defendants' upcoming trial college session. The Court believes the discovery provided is sufficient and any further documents would exceed proportionality.

Lastly, the Court heard argument about a recording of a board meeting that may exist. The Court was not provided any information that the recording in fact exists, so it appears Defendants have fulfilled discovery obligations.